

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 24-27 are newly added. Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullendore (US 2003/018514) in view of Beukema (USP 6,978,300). Independent claim 1 has been amended to facilitate prosecution. Claims 21-23 have been canceled. Claims 24-27 are new. Claims 24-27 are believed supported at least in Figures 1-4 and associated description including page 8, line 28 - page 10, line 24. The amendments are believed to introduce no new matter and are believed to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite an apparatus configured to “send a transfer ready command frame to the Host before receiving the transfer ready command from the target, wherein the transfer ready command received from the target is suppressed.” New claims 24 and 27 recite “sending a transfer ready command using the initialized RX_ID value to the host prior to receiving the transfer ready command from the target, wherein sending the transfer ready command to the host allows the switch to operate as a proxy for the target.” Neither reference either alone or combination teaches or suggests these recitations. Beukema, for example, does not teach or suggest sending the transfer ready to the host before receiving the transfer ready command from the target. The Examiner may attempt to argue that Mullendore describes these recitations. The Applicants’ Representative respectfully disagrees.

Mullendore does send transfer ready commands to an initiator. However, these transfer ready commands are sent either after a transfer ready command is received from the target or are sent in absence of a transfer ready command from the target. For example, Figures 5, 6, 11, and 12 show a switch sending the transfer ready command to the host after the transfer ready command is received from the target. Figures 4 and 7 show a switch sending the transfer ready command to the host in absence of a transfer ready command from the target. None of these show a transfer ready command sent to the host before a transfer ready command is received from the target.

Independent claim 1 also recites processing the “trapped write command by initializing either the OX_ID or RX_ID.” Independent claims 24 and 27 recite “initialializing the receiver exchange identifier (RX_ID) value to generate an initialized RX_ID value using the target identifier” and “sending the transfer ready command including the initialized RX_ID value.”

The Examiner notes that Mullendore does not teach or suggest “a frame having a header with an OX_ID or RX_ID” and does not modify either the “OX_ID or RX_ID” of the write command header. The Examiner relies on Beukema to teach or suggest this recitation. The Examiner argues that Beukema states that routers routinely modify packet network headers and the network header includes routing information such as the destination IP address and other network routing information.

The Applicants’ Representative respectfully submits that modifying a network header “when the packet crosses a subnet boundary” (column 11, lines 36-38) is not modifying an OX_ID or an RX_ID in a frame. According to various embodiments, the OX_ID and RX_ID values are separate from source and destination addresses that the Examiner argues are the OX_ID and RX_ID. If the techniques of the present invention were to simply modify the source and destination addresses, the write command would be misrouted. Consequently, the techniques of the present invention intelligently operate to modify the OX_ID or RX_ID to for example, allow the switch to “operate as a proxy for the target” as recited in independent claims 24 and 27.

The independent claims also recite “initializing” the RX_ID or OX_ID. It is true that some routers will sometimes change source and destination addresses at subnet boundaries as Beukema states. However, even if these source and destination addresses are properly interpreted to be OX_ID and RX_ID values, Beukema still does not initialize source and/or destination addresses at a switch. If a source and destination address in Beukema were transmitted uninitialized to a switch, the switch would not know what to do with the uninitialized value and it would lead to error and improper network operation. By contrast, the independent claims recite initializing an OX_ID or RX_ID value at a switch. The initialized value is then sent to the host in a transfer ready command. It is theoretically possible that Mullendore and/or Beukema describe the recitations noted above, but these recitations are not taught or suggested by the cited references and can not be assumed

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, the rejections to the independent claims are believed overcome for at least the reasons noted above. Applicants' Representative believes that all pending claims are allowable in their present form. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns for Applicants' Representative, the Examiner is encouraged to contact her at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/ G. Audrey Kwan/
Godfrey Audrey Kwan
Reg. No. 46,850

G. Audrey Kwan
Beyer Weaver, LLP
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100